

Serial No. 09,593,912
Attorney Docket No. E0897
Firm Reference No. AMDSP0368US

Reply to Office Action Dated February 6, 2004 filed with RCE
and Petition For A One-Month Extension Of Time
Reply Dated May 7, 2004

REMARKS

Following entry of this amendment, claims 1-18 and 27-34 will be pending. Claims 19-26 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 7, 13 and 16 have been amended. Claims 27-34 have been added.

I. AFFIRMATION OF RECORD OF INTERVIEW SUMMARY

The Applicant affirms that the Interview Summary Form is a complete and proper recordation of the interview conducted on 24 March 2004 between the Examiner, Kwang B. Yao, and Andrew Romero, the Applicant's representative.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Engdahl et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,493,571 ("Engdahl"). Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1, 7, 13 and 16 have been amended to include, *inter alia*, the feature "the common bus serving as a direct interface between the media access controller and the physical layer devices. Engdahl does not teach or suggest time division multiplexed communication between a MAC and a number of physical layer devices along a common bus serving as a direct interface between the media access controller (MAC) and the physical layer devices as recited in amended claims 1, 7, 13 and 16.

The Examiner contends the I/O devices connected to the I/O node 16 in Fig. 1 are physical layer devices. Further, the Examiner contends the host bus 101 is the common bus serving as a direct interface between the SMAC 100 and the I/O devices. See, page 6, item 3 of the Action. The Applicants respectfully disagree with these arguments.

Even if the I/O devices are physical layer devices as the Examiner suggests, the I/O devices are **not directly** connected to a MAC as recited in the present claims. That is, Engdahl does not disclose the I/O devices are **directly** connected to the SMAC of node 16 by a common

Serial No. 09,593,912

Attorney Docket No. E0897

Firm Reference No. AMDSP0368US

Reply to Office Action Dated February 6, 2004 filed with RCE
and Petition For A One-Month Extension Of Time
Reply Dated May 7, 2004

bus without any intervening devices. To the contrary, Engdahl discloses the SMAC 100 connects to the host bus 101 via the host interface 143. The host bus 101 is connected to the host processor 102 (an intervening device). See, for example, Fig. 5A, Col 35, lines 23-27 and Col. 13, lines 40-41. The host processor 102 is connected to ports on the node 16 (Engdahl refers to node 16 as a controller, however, this "controller" is a computer not a MAC). The node 16 includes direct connections between ports on the node 16 and each separate I/O device. See, for example, Col. 1, lines 25-26.

Therefore, since Engdahl does not teach or suggest one or more of the features as claimed in claims 1, 7, 13 and 16, claims 1, 7, 13 and 16 and the claims that depend therefrom are patentable over Engdahl for at least the reasons stated above.

III. NEW CLAIMS

The newly added claims, i.e., claims 27-34, claim additional novel and unobvious features of the present invention. The features of claims 27-34 are supported by the specification and no new matter is believed to be added. See, for example, page 5, lines 19-21. Claims 27-34 recites, *inter alia*, the feature "on an integrated circuit." To the contrary, Engdahl discloses communication over serial communication links. Additionally, Engdahl discloses the controllers to be computers, weld controllers or motor drives. Further, Engdahl discloses the direct connections between the ports on the controller and each separate I/O device may be spread out over a large area. See, for example, Col. 1, lines 8-29. Further still, Engdahl discloses the network medium to be a coaxial or fiber optic cable. See, for example, Col. 5, lines 3-30. These features are all too large to fit on an integrated circuit. Therefore, claims 27-34 are patentable over Engdahl for at least these additional reasons.

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the

Serial No. 09,593,912
Attorney Docket No. E0897
Firm Reference No. AMDSP0368US

Reply to Office Action Dated February 6, 2004 filed with RCE
and Petition For A One-Month Extension Of Time
Reply Dated May 7, 2004

application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present invention.

Any fee(s) resulting from this communication is hereby authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 18-0988; Our Order No. E0897 (AMDSP0368US).

Respectfully submitted,
RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP


Andrew Romero, Reg. No. 43,890

1621 Euclid Avenue, 19th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-2191
Telephone: (216) 621-1113
Facsimile: (216) 621-6165

R:\ARomero\Cases\AMDSP0368US\Reply to Final Office Action dated 020604 filed with RCE.doc